APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/047,341	01/15/2002	Carl E. Rogers	1690	5083

28004   7590   08/06/2003

SPRINT
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY
KSOPHT0101-Z2100
OVERLAND PARK, KS   66251-2100

EXAMINER
ELAHEE, MD S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2697	3

DATE MAILED: 08/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	10/047,341		ROGERS ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Md S Elahee		2697	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>03</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .   6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1.   Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, it is not clear whether the SCP system includes a destination

processor. The disclosure and Fig.1 show that the destination processor is not included in the

SCP.

Regarding claim 11, it is not clear whether the SCP system or a destination processor

transfers the destination routing instruction to the switching system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 11, 12, 14-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Ekstrom et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,148,069) and in view of Hetz (U.S. Patent

No. 5,566,235).

Regarding claim 1, Ekstrom teaches that in a switching system, routing a call to a

intelligent peripheral (IP) (fig.3; col.3, lines 22-28, col.5, lines 19-31, col.8, lines 39-42;

'intelligent peripheral (IP)' reads on the claim 'service platform').

Ekstrom further teaches that in the intelligent peripheral (IP), playing announcement over the call, collecting caller-entered information from a caller over the call in response to the announcement, and transferring the caller-entered password to a Service Control Point (SCP) system (fig.4; col.9, lines 36-53; 'intelligent peripheral (IP)' reads on the claim 'service platform', 'playing announcement' reads on the claim 'transferring a prompt message' and 'password' reads on the claim 'information').

However, Ekstrom fails to teach "transferring the caller-entered information to a destination processor, processing a destination routing code from the destination processor to determine a destination routing instruction, and transferring the destination routing instruction to the switching system". Hetz teaches transferring the call data message to a SCP 35 or 45, processing a destination routing code from the SCP 35 or 45 to determine a destination routing instruction, and transferring the destination routing instruction to the switching system (col.9, lines 56-67, col.10, lines 1-7, 54-67, col.11, lines 1-10; 'call data message' reads on the claim 'caller-entered information' and 'SCP 35 or 45' reads on the claim 'destination processor'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ekstrom to transfer the caller-entered information to a destination processor, processing a destination routing code from the destination processor to determine a destination routing instruction, and transferring the destination routing instruction to the switching system as taught by Hetz. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the routing information for the call.

Ekstrom further teaches that in the switching system, routing the call to the subscriber's pager in response to the destination routing instruction (fig.4; col.9, lines 62-67, col.10, lines 1-3; 'subscriber's pager' reads on the claim 'destination').

Regarding claims 2 and 12, Ekstrom fails to teach "destination processor selects the destination routing code based on the caller-entered information". Hetz teaches that the SCP 35 or 45, processing a destination routing code based on the call data message (col.9, lines 56-67, col.10, lines 1-7, 54-67, col.11, lines 1-10; 'SCP 35 or 45' reads on the claim 'destination processor' and 'call data message' reads on the claim 'caller-entered information'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ekstrom to have the destination processor in order to select the destination routing code based on the caller-entered information as taught by Hetz. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the routing information for the call.

Regarding claims 4 and 14, Ekstrom teaches that in the intelligent peripheral (IP), initiating the second call comprises using a different telephone number than the caller used to place the first call (col.9, lines 43-67, col.10, lines 1-3; 'intelligent peripheral (IP)' reads on the claim 'service platform').

Regarding claims 5 and 15, Ekstrom teaches that in the intelligent peripheral (IP), transferring the announcement comprises applying a call processing script, and wherein, the call processing script indicates the different telephone number (fig.4; col.9, lines 43-67, col.10, lines 1-3; 'intelligent peripheral (IP)' reads on the claim 'service platform' and 'announcement' reads on the claim 'prompt message').

Regarding claims 6 and 16, Ekstrom teaches that the caller-entered information comprises a caller password (col.9, lines 43-67; 'caller password' reads on the claim 'caller identification number or a caller account number').

Regarding claims 8 and 18, Ekstrom teaches that in the switching system, removing the intelligent peripheral (IP) from the call after the service node collects the caller-entered information (col.9, lines 43-67; 'intelligent peripheral (IP)' reads on the claim 'service platform').

Regarding claim 11, Ekstrom teaches that in a switching system, routing a call to a intelligent peripheral (IP) (fig.3; col.3, lines 22-28, col.5, lines 19-31, col.8, lines 39-42; 'intelligent peripheral (IP)' reads on the claim 'service platform').

Ekstrom further teaches the intelligent peripheral (IP) configured to play announcement over the call, collecting caller-entered information from a caller over the call in response to the announcement, and transferring the caller-entered password to a Service Control Point (SCP) system (fig.4; col.9, lines 36-53; 'intelligent peripheral (IP)' reads on the claim 'service platform', 'play announcement' reads on the claim 'transfer a prompt message' and 'password' reads on the claim 'information').

However, Ekstrom fails to teach "transfer the caller-entered information to a destination processor, processing a destination routing code from the destination processor to determine a destination routing instruction, and transferring the destination routing instruction to the switching system". Hetz teaches transferring the call data message to a SCP 35 or 45, processing a destination routing code from the SCP 35 or 45 to determine a destination routing instruction,

and transferring the destination routing instruction to the switching system (col.9, lines 56-67,

col.10, lines 1-7, 54-67, col.11, lines 1-10; 'call data message' reads on the claim 'caller-entered

information' and 'SCP 35 or 45' reads on the claim 'destination processor'). Thus, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

Ekstrom to transfer the caller-entered information to a destination processor, processing a

destination routing code from the destination processor to determine a destination routing

instruction, and transferring the destination routing instruction to the switching system as taught

by Hetz. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the routing

information for the call.

Ekstrom further teaches that in the switching system, routing the call to the subscriber's

pager in response to the destination routing instruction (fig.4; col.9, lines 62-67, col.10, lines 1-3;

'subscriber's pager' reads on the claim 'destination').

4.   Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ekstrom

et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,148,069) and in view of Hetz (U.S. Patent No. 5,566,235) and further in

view of Latter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,574,319).

Regarding claims 3 and 13, Ekstrom teaches that in the intelligent peripheral (IP),

transferring a tracking number to the SCP system with the caller-entered password, initiating a

second call to the switching system and transferring the tracking number to the switching system

with the second call (col.9, lines 43-49, 65-67, col.10, lines 1-3; 'intelligent peripheral (IP)' reads

on the claim 'service platform' and 'password' reads on the claim 'information').

However, Ekstrom in view of Hetz fails to teach "connecting the first call to the second call". Latter teaches connecting the first call to the second call (col.10, lines 4-8). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ekstrom in view of Hetz to connect the first call to the second call as taught by Latter. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to complete the call.

Ekstrom further teaches that in a switching system, transferring an SCP query for the second call to the SCP system (col.9, lines 65-67, col.10, lines 1-3).

Ekstrom further teaches in the SCP system, in the SCP system, correlating the SCP query with the caller-entered password based on the tracking number (col.9, lines 43-49, 65-62; 'password' reads on the claim 'information').

However, Ekstrom further fails to teach "processing the SCP query to transfer the caller-entered information to the destination processor". Hetz teaches processing the SCP query to transfer the call data message to the SCP 35 or 45 (col.9, lines 56-67, col.10, lines 1-7, 54-67, col.11, lines 1-10; 'call data message' reads on the claim 'caller-entered information' and 'SCP 35 or 45' reads on the claim 'destination processor'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ekstrom to process the SCP query to transfer the caller-entered information to the destination processor as taught by Hetz. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the routing information for the call.

Ekstrom further teaches that in the switching system, routing the first call to the subscriber comprises routing the second call to the subscriber in response to the destination

routing instruction (col.9, lines 43-49, 65-67, col.10, lines 1-3; 'subscriber' reads on the claim 'destination').

5.   Claims 7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ekstrom et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,148,069) and in view of Hetz (U.S. Patent No. 5,566,235) and further in view of Sbisa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,470,081).

Regarding claims 7 and 17, Ekstrom in view of Hetz fails to teach "the caller-entered information comprises a frequent flyer number". Sbisa teaches the caller-entered information comprising a frequent flyer number (col.9, lines 14-21). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ekstrom in view of Hetz to have the caller-entered information comprising a frequent flyer number as taught by Sbisa. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to process a particular call.

6.   Claims 9, 10, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ekstrom et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,148,069) and in view of Hetz (U.S. Patent No. 5,566,235) and further in view of Morrisey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,524,146).

Regarding claims 9 and 19, Ekstrom fails to teach "in the SCP system, transferring an Automatic Number Identification (ANI) to the destination processor wherein the destination processor selects the destination routing code based on the ANI". Hetz teaches transferring the call data message to a SCP 35 or 45 wherein the the SCP 35 or 45 selects the destination routing code based on the call data message (col.9, lines 56-67, col.10, lines 1-7, 54-67, col.11, lines 1-10; 'SCP 35 or 45' reads on the claim 'destination processor'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ekstrom to

transfer an Automatic Number Identification (ANI) to the destination processor wherein the destination processor selects the destination routing code based on the ANI as taught by Hetz. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the routing information for the call.

However, Ekstrom in view of Hetz further fails to teach transferring an Automatic Number Identification (ANI) to the destination processor. Morrisey teaches forwarding an Automatic Number Identification (ANI) to the tandem (col.13, lines 34-46; 'forwarding' reads on the claim 'transferring' and 'tandem' reads on the claim 'destination processor'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ekstrom in view of Hetz to transfer an Automatic Number Identification (ANI) to the destination processor as taught by Morrisey. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide identification of the calling party.

Regarding claims 10 and 20, Ekstrom teaches that the subscriber's pager correlates the caller-entered password with the call received into the subscriber's pager based on the caller number (col.9, lines 43-49, 65-67, col.10, lines 1-3; 'subscriber's pager' reads on the claim 'destination' and 'password' reads on the claim 'information').

However, Ekstrom in view of Hetz fails to teach the destination based on the ANI. Morrisey teaches destination based on the ANI (col.13, lines 34-46, col.16, lines 15-20; 'forwarding' reads on the claim 'transferring' and 'tandem' reads on the claim 'destination processor'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ekstrom in view of Hetz to have the destination based on the ANI

as taught by Morrisey. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to

provide the call routing information based on the identification of the calling party.

Conclusion

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Alam Elahee whose telephone number is (703) 305-4822. The

examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 9:00am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Jeffrey Hofsass can be reached on (703)305-4717. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular

communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.

M. E.
MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE
July 31, 2003

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600